LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

+ + + + +

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

+ + + + +

COPYRIGHT ARBITRATION ROYALTY PANEL

+ + + + +

In the matter of:

Docket No. 2000-9

Digital Performance Right in Sound Recording and Ephemeral Recording

CARP DTRA

CARP Hearing Room
LM-414
Library of Congress
Madison Building
101 Independence Ave, SE
Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, October 10, 2001

The above-entitled matter came on for rebuttal hearing, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m.

BEFORE

THE HONORABLE ERIC E. VAN LOON Chairman
THE HONORABLE JEFFREY S. GULIN Arbitrator
THE HONORABLE CURTIS E. von KANN Arbitrator

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of Clear Channel Communications, Inc., National Religious Broadcasters Music License Committee, and Salem Communications Corporation

KARYN ABLIN, ESQ.
BRUCE G. JOSEPH, ESQ.
THOMAS W. KIRBY, ESQ.
DINEEN PASHOUKOS WASYLIK, ESQ.
of: Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 719-4913 (202) 719-7000

On Behalf of American Federation of Television and Radio Artists

ARTHUR J. LEVINE, ESQ.
of: Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, LLP
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3315
(202) 408-4032

On Behalf of the Association for Independent Music

JACQUES M. RIMOKH, ESQ.
BARRY I. SLOTNIK, ESQ.
of: Loeb & Loeb, LLP
345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154-0037
(212) 407-4900

APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

On Behalf of BET.com; CBS Broadcasting, Inc.; Comedy Central; Coollink Broadcast Network; Echo Networks, Inc.; Everstream, Inc.; Incanta, Inc.; Launch Media, Inc.; Listen.com; Live365.com; MTVi Group, LLC; MusicMatch, Inc.; MyPlay, Inc.; NetRadio Corporation; Radioactive Media Partners, Inc.; RadioWave.com, Inc.; Entercom Communications Corporation; Spinner Networks, Inc.; Susquehanna Radio Corp.; Univision Online; Westwind Media.com, Inc.; and Xact Radio Network, LLC

ADAM I. COHEN, ESQ.

MARK A. JACOBY, ESQ.

R. BRUCE RICH, ESQ.

FIONA SCHAEFFER, ESQ.

KENNETH L. STEINTHAL, ESQ.

of: Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP 767 Fifth Avenue New York, New York 10153 (212) 310-8622

On Behalf of AEI Music Network; DMX Music, Inc. SANDRA M. AISTARS, ESQ.
DAVID R. BERZ, ESQ.

of: Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP 1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 682-7272

On Behalf of the Recording Industry Association of America, Inc.

JOHN A. FREEDMAN, ESQ.
ROBERT ALAN GARRETT, ESQ.
HADRIAN R. KATZ, ESQ.
BRAD R. NEWBERG, ESQ.
RONALD A. SCHECHTER, ESQ.
JULE L. SIGALL, ESQ.
CHRISTOPHER WINTERS, ESQ.
MICHELE J. WOODS, ESQ.

of: Arnold & Porter
555 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 942-5719

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

On Behalf of Public Radio:

DENISE LEARY, ESQ.

of: Public Radio, Inc.

635 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001

(202) 513-2049

On Behalf of American Federation of Musicians of the United States and Canada:

PATRICIA POLACH, ESQ.

of: Bredhoff & Kaiser, P.L.L.C.

805 15th Street, N.W.

Suite 1000

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 842-2600

NEAL R. GROSS

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

11:03 a.m.

MR. STEINTHAL: So we were able, through contacts to three of the five major studios -Paramount Pictures, Walt Disney and Warner Brothers -to secure certain data that would permit Dr. Jaffe to conduct an analysis. And we basically asked for data with respect to -- we'll start with movies -- movie transactions for a concrete period of time within the last two years. For example, I think in the case of each of the studios, they gave us movie transactions, which we did not select, they basically gave us their slate within a given time period of pictures that they produced and have the data for.

Now, again what we get into in the movie world is you often have situations where a studio may distribute 20 pictures in the course of a year but only really produce themselves seven or eight or ten. A lot of times there's this phenomenon called negative pickups where some independent producer does all the production work, the distributor, quote, "picks up the negative," and distributes it but doesn't have the

same relationship in terms of having the data and having conducted the negotiations.

So, basically, they gave us their data with respect to pictures that had any, according to them, any significant degree of source music. again, if you're doing a movie and the only music to speak of is written expressly for the movie -- suppose you have a movie where 95 percent of the music is score music. Well, in that situation you're not going to have any observations that are relevant to this analysis, because all the music's been written for the There's no, what is in the jargon, source movie. music, no preexisting sound recordings that are being used as part of the movie, because virtually all the music in it has been written by the score writer, and you don't have the relationship where you have source music and you can make observations about one versus the other.

So we were advised that they were going to give us the movies during -- and I think with two of the studios they gave us their year 2000 slate where they had the movies that they produced containing any

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

significant source music.	And I	think	on the	Disney
side, it was a period it	was	a year	again,	but it
was like June to June, June	200	to June	e 2001.	

Now, what did they give us? Well, in fact, the way it worked was that with respect to Warner Brothers, they did the review and they gave us a summary of the transactions, the underlying sync and master use transactions, and provided an opportunity to check the data, if you will, against their summary to make sure it was accurate. Similarly, with respect to Paramount, they did the same thing, and in addition, they gave us a summary document that they had prepared, summarizing again the numbers relevant to the sync and the master use fees.

On the Disney side, and this -- and Paramount, as well, gave us the opportunity -- gave Dr. Jaffe the opportunity to check the underlying licenses against the summary they had prepared to make sure the numbers were accurate.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: What does that mean?

MR. STEINTHAL: In other words -
ARBITRATOR VON KANN: He looked at the

NEAL R. GROSS

agreements?

MR. STEINTHAL: Yes, yes.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: All 800 of them?

MR. STEINTHAL: No. Well, on the Paramount side, I believe one of Dr. Jaffe's staff members working with him closely on his papers reviewed all of the underlying source materials on Paramount. I don't believe it was done on a census basis on Warner.

And with respect to Disney, what Disney has is a what they call their music licensing review. They have a schedule that they prepare on the ordinary course of business that summarizes -- having nothing to do with the CARP and nothing to do with this production -- they have a film-by-film schedule indicating for every piece of music that ultimately gets into the film a summary of the rights issues and the fees paid. And they provided Dr. Jaffe with that summary for the one-year time period covered by the -- I think it was June to June, June 2000 to June 2001.

So in that respect, reliance by Dr. Jaffe was made on the ordinary course of business summary

created by Disney, logging each transaction and and conditions, terms relevant indicating the including the fees paid for those transactions.

Now, there are 851 "observations," quote, And I think Mr. unquote, contained in the data. Garrett's correct that if you look at it from the standpoint, if it breaks out evenly, 400 and some odd sync licenses and 400 and some odd master use licenses that would literally underlie this data.

We are in an odd Now, I'll say this: We'd be happy, in an odd way, if every position. piece of paper, was available. But by the same token, it was provided to us with direct instructions that things should be as limited as possible in burden and, because of the very confidential nature of these transactions, in what gets produced here.

I have had several conversations with Mr. Garrett hoping to come to a compromise that, frankly, I could broker between the RIAA's desires to have data that would give them a comfort level as to exactly what is underlying the schedules that were prepared by the studios. He's asked for a number of things that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I've agreed to give him already, subject to the Court's ordering it, because, again, I'm in a situation where my instructions are provide as little as possible, instructions from the third parties, because of their concerns about confidentiality.

I have advised them that they're not going to get away with providing no information and that I would get back to them after presenting their case, if you will, and having the Panel order whatever it is that fairly gives the RIAA an opportunity to test the data without unduly burdening third parties to this proceeding.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Why are they concerned about confidentiality if his people look at it but not if Jaffe looks at it and puts it in evidence here?

MR. STEINTHAL: It's basically, Your Honor, an issue of industry paranoia, for lack of a better word. Every studio is worried that another studio's going to find out what they paid for a certain sync fee or a master use fee. Dr. Jaffe's not in the business, okay? So Dr. Jaffe --

1	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: But they're telling
2	us what they paid for it. This is a matter of simply
3	verifying.
4	MR. STEINTHAL: Well, if you look at Dr.
5	Jaffe's report I don't know if you've looked at it
6	yet
7	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Nothing specific is
8	there.
9	MR. STEINTHAL: It doesn't identify the
10	it says Studio A, Studio B, Studio C composition
11	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Right.
12	MR. STEINTHAL: And we identified the
13	composition but it's not by attribution. Nothing's
14	attributed to Warner specifically or Disney
15	specifically. And their real concern, and it is a
16	legitimate industry concern, is that this data gets
L7	out that Warner paid less for Moondance than Paramount
18	did, and the use is comparable. What's going on here?
19	I mean it's very competitive in that respect, and
20	that's why they've gone to great lengths to try to
21	limit that which gets produced.

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: They can actually feel

ľ	
1	great comfort that what he finds is it's 95, 96, 97.
2	I mean it's so close that nobody is clearly making a
3	killing
4	MR. STEINTHAL: On the relationship issue,
5	Your Honor.
6	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Yes.
7	MR. STEINTHAL: But what is clear is that
8	the relationship issue, sync and masters are almost
9	invariably one to one, but the absolute dollars does
10	vary. You may find that Studio X paid \$50,000 for the
11	composition that Studio Y paid \$30,000 for. That's
12	where the rub is. I think that's one of the key
13	issues.
14	ARBITRATOR GULIN: But as we sit here
15	today, you don't know whether they would object to
16	providing copies of these licenses.
17	MR. STEINTHAL: I do. Let me go on,
18	because I've had several conversations with Mr.
19	Garrett. Again, I feel like I'm the broker in this,
20	and I'm trying to as I said, if I had my druthers,
21	everything would be out in the open, but those weren't

the circumstances surrounding our ability to get the

data to Dr. Jaffe in the first place.

1.2

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Could I, Mr. Steinthal, ask the question, if where you're going is if you had an order from the CARP directing that this be done, which with no subpoena power and various other shortcomings may be completely unenforceable, but you'd have a piece of paper, you could say, "The devil made me do it," that you think in fact from the conversations you've had so far that that would do the trick?

MR. STEINTHAL: To a certain extent, and that's what I'm going to get to. Because what I tried to do is find out what the RIAA would accept in the way of less than a full universe of every single sync license and master use license underlying the data and what I think the studios would, under the circumstances produce, albeit under very restricted protective order.

Mr. Garrett asked -- he sent us an e-mail the other day and he asked us for six things, and I'm substantially there as to what I think the labels, upon -- I mean the studios, upon being ordered to do

so, would agreed to do. First of all, the request has
been made that for every single observation, we
identify who the studio was, what the film was, what
the song was, who the publisher or the label was and
what the fee was. And we're fine with that, again,
subject to a protective order, which is outside
counsel only. There would be no question as to all
841 of those observations or however many observations
there were who the copyright owner was, what the song
was, what the movies was. So all that identifying
information would be made available.

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Let me just interrupt again, if I can, to make sure what you're doing here. You would need -- assuming that you're in agreement, meeting of the minds, with Mr. Garrett on his points one through six, or five of the six or whatever, you're nonetheless going to need a CARP directive or

MR. STEINTHAL: Yes. I'm going to need an order that says that we are ordered to produce the following materials --

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. STEINTHAL: -- that I can then go to the studios and say, "We've been ordered to produce this stuff. Unless we get it from you, we've got this very difficult situation." No, there's no subpoena power, but they know, I've been in touch with all of them.

And, again, as the Panel appreciates, these companies are third parties, they do have relationships on both sides of the fence, but they are not directly involved in this. The studios, themselves, and I can't underscore enough how, yes, in the big picture there are AOLs of the world, there are Viacoms in the world, but if you're the guy who's running the Music Group at Disney, you're not getting help from anybody else in responding to these inquiries.

And Disney is the least involved in this proceeding, in an odd sort of way, in the sense that they're not actively participating through any of their divisions other than through they do have a record company that is an RIAA member, but it's not a huge record company, it's not one of the five majors.

NEAL R. GROSS

They do own ABC, which has radio stations, but they are not streaming right now. So it's an odd situation.

We're asking companies, in particular people at companies, that do not have any vested interest in the outcome of this proceeding to go through lots of data and provide them to the Panel as part of the ability to see what Dr. Jaffe did. And that's why I think we can accommodate much of Mr. Garrett's desires in a manner I think the studios will agree to cooperate with. And if I can continue, I'll explain exactly --

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: One question on the mechanics. You say Jaffe sent an aide, I think you said, in a couple -- so someone who works with Jaffe actually went to the studio and sat down in a room somewhere and somebody brought in a bunch of documents, and he spent a day looking through it or whatever?

MR. STEINTHAL: That is true with respect to one of the studios, yes.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Only one?

NEAL R. GROSS

1.1

MR. STEINTHAL: Right. 1 ARBITRATOR VON KANN: The others handled 2 it --3 MR. STEINTHAL: With respect to one of the 4 studios, that was done only on a spot basis. And with 5 respect to the other studio, Disney, it was done 6 entirely off of this ordinary course of business log 7 that summarizes in the ordinary -- again, I can't --8 I want to be very clear, this is not something that 9 was created for the CARP. This is their Bible, if you 10 will. When films are being done and completed, they 11 log in all the songs that have been included, what the 12 key terms are, what the price is that's paid for each, 13 and they have that log, and the log was the basis for 14 the Disney movies and TV shows of the information. 15 That's the standard CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: 16 Disney operating procedures on all of these. 17 MR. STEINTHAL: That's right. And as I 18 get to this, I will explain what Disney is offering us 19 to do here in a manner to try to limit its burden but 20 at the same time provide the Panel and the RIAA an 21

NEAL R. GROSS

ability to understand what's going on.

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: I understand it has
an overarching sort of point without before we get
to specifics, I can understand the difficulties you've
described, but isn't it perfectly clear that we can't
receive Jaffe's testimony on this point unless they
have a chance to look at the same stuff he looked at?
I can't see any way around that. Maybe life is hard,
and maybe you're dealing with paranoid people. Tough.
You can't put it in and say, "Our guy checked it out,
but these guys can't." Now, we have to figure out
some fair, legitimate way for them to check it out
that isn't too burdensome.

MR. STEINTHAL: And that's where I'm going.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: And maybe if they're paranoid that these record labels will do it, maybe they designate some independent guy to go in and check it out. But I can't see how you can possibly put Jaffe's analysis in unless they get to look at exactly what he looked at.

ARBITRATOR GULIN: I think what we're doing now is you're reciting an offer to the other

1

side of what you're --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. GARRETT: No, no, no. This concerns me, because this is an offer that I made to settle this dispute here. I want to make it very clear that I believe that we're entitled to all of the underlying agreements and the associated records here. Those are all underlying documents within the meaning of the CARP rules. There's no question in our mind that those documents should have been produced to us last Friday.

I made an offer to try to get this thing resolved here, because I, too, am concerned about burdens here. I am concerned about having to cross examine Mr. Jaffe in a relatively short period of time, and before that, going through hundreds of different records here. This is a study that I believe should have been presented during the direct This should have been presented during the case. direct case when we would have had three months or so to prepare for it, when we would have opportunity to bring a rebuttal witness in. This is study designed to nothing more than a

statements that Mr. Jaffe made during the direct case.

2.0

But putting that issue aside, now I believe we're entitled to all of this and I really do have an objection with Mr. Steinthal without my consent here reciting to you all of the terms of an offer that I made to resolve this. I think the issue here is what is it that these companies are willing to do at this point here, and whether that is sufficient to satisfy their obligations.

MR. STEINTHAL: Then I won't go through the list that Mr. Garrett and I discussed, and I'll just limit it to what I believe we can obtain from the studios that I believe would be a fair approach to this issue and constitute, at the same time, virtually all that Dr. Jaffe has had access to as well.

As I said in the first instance, the identity of every transaction is not going to be an issue. We will be able to identify by name, movie, song, et cetera, every "observation," quote, unquote, that's underlying this aspect of Dr. Jaffe's study.

As far as the actual underlying agreements
-- sync licenses and master use licenses -- with

NEAL R. GROSS

respect to Warner Brothers and Paramount, we believe that a fair sample of the underlying agreements, coupled with the actual summaries that were prepared by those studios and given to Dr. Jaffe, should be adequate. In other words, putting aside Disney for a minute, each of Warner Brothers and Paramount created a schedule for the movies and programs that were within the time frame that we talked about, and delivered to Dr. Jaffe a schedule, by film and title of each transaction and what the fee was.

What we would propose to do is provide those summaries, plus a sample of the actual underlying agreements so that the RIAA would have both the ability to assess whether the agreements comport with the summaries that were prepared by the studios themselves in the first place, as well as having the hard documents to look at, and if they wanted to cross examine Dr. Jaffe about certain terms and conditions contained in any of these licenses, then fine. But it would be done on a sample basis rather than on a census basis to minimize the burden to the studio.

With respect to Disney, Disney very much

would prefer to provide the actual log, which is its ordinary course of business log, with a declaration, if that would help the cause, as to exactly what that log is meant to contain in the way of information and confirming that it is done in the ordinary course and having nothing to do with this CARP, and that it does in fact lay out the key terms and fees paid for all the songs that are contained in the movies and TV shows that are covered by the log.

So with respect to the three studios, it's sort of category A would be Paramount and Warner Brothers, and category B would be Disney. Disney would prefer not to undertake the burden of going back and pulling out all of the licenses associated with a sample of the films and instead provide, in essence, a census through the log that it keeps with a verification as to exactly what is and is not contained in that log.

In addition, we would be prepared to provide the actual summary documents that we have received. So to the extent that the studios have created summaries that were provided to Dr. Jaffe,

we'll	produce	those	in	disc	cover	у.	W	е	have	no
object	ion to do	ing tha	t, o	ther	thar	ı th	e fa	act	that	. we
need t	o have an	order o	compe	ellir	ıg us	to	do	it	and t	hat
it be	done on a	restri	cted	. bas	is.					
	So,	basica	lly,	I t	hink	we	can	fa	airly	get

So, basically, I think we can fairly get to a result where all of the materials furnished to Dr. Jaffe in terms of the summary documents will be provided to the RIAA. The log from Disney, which is all that Dr. Jaffe relied upon with respect to Disney, will be provided, along with some sort of declaration so that it's clear that it is an ordinary course of document.

This is, to me, not unlike the P&Ls we were talking about before in the sense that it's an ordinary course of document setting forth the key financial terms that relate to the films that are the subject of this data. And it is exactly what Dr. Jaffe looked at.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: In the case of Disney, Jaffe did not see the underlying agreements.

MR. STEINTHAL: That's correct.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Jaffe only saw the

NEAL R. GROSS

log.

MR. STEINTHAL: Correct.

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: And this offer is to provide 100 percent of what Jaffe saw.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Yes. That's what it amounts to.

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Right.

MR. GARRETT: Well, let me just make clear that when we were talking about their discovery request of us, it goes beyond just what our expert saw. We talked about Dr. Schink. All Dr. Schink saw was the different exhibits that had been produced by the witnesses who we are bringing in to testify. That was not sufficient for them. They wanted the underlying documents, even though Dr. Schink did not see them. I think the Copyright Office rules are also very clear, or least the interpretations of those rules are very clear, that the fact that didn't see them is not determinative here of whether it's to be turned over.

In this case, we're talking about agreements that have a variety of different

provisions, all of which can bear upon the ultimate price, and I think we're entitled to look at all of the different terms of conditions of those agreements to determine to what extent they might have affected the price that's paid for the sound recording or the price that's paid for the musical work.

You know that they go even further in this case. It wasn't enough just to look at agreements in our case, they wanted to know all of the facts and circumstances surrounding those agreements -- who the parties were negotiated, what kinds of communications they had back and forth, what were the issues that were raised during those negotiations? I don't have a prayer of getting that kind of information in time to cross examine Dr. Jaffe here, but I certainly draw the line here at the agreements. I don't think the fact that Dr. Jaffe did not go and look at the actual agreements, which he probably should have, provides a basis or an excuse for them not to comply with their discovery obligations here.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: As a practical matter, we're talking about Jaffe testifying ten days

from now, and we've got 800 agreements here to check out. I mean I know you work hard, Mr. Garrett, but

3 how can this possibly be done?

MR. GARRETT: Well, yes. My view is that, again, that all of this stuff should be stricken, because they were obliged to produce those documents under the rules we all agreed to on Friday. And here we are, we're still arguing about those 800 agreements. What I have offered to do here is to take a sample. I am not anxious to go through all 800, but I'll take a sample on several conditions.

One is, is that they agree that the sample we take here is indeed representative of that whole group. I don't want to come in and say -- start cross examining him about some agreement and say, "Oh, yes, but if you had looked at the other 700 or so, you would have found something entirely different." So I'm willing to do as a sample as long as we all agree that we can -- that the documents we actually look at are truly representative of this. And this is a sample of not even a randomly selected sample. I mean this is just -- I still don't know how all of these

movies were	chosen amon	g the hund:	reds	of m	ovies	thai
are done by	just these	companies,	but	we'l	l put	that
aside.						

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: He said he'll give you the sample on Warner and Sony. So it's just Disney that we have an issue about getting a sample, as I understand it.

MR. GARRETT: Yes. And as it turned out, from the sample that we just sort of randomly selected here, Disney had the most of the agreements, at least that's what I understand from Mr. Steinthal.

But I also want to make it clear that I wanted these things -- I mean we sent an e-mail on Saturday as soon as we realized that they hadn't been turned over. We didn't wait until our conference call Monday. We told them on Saturday we wanted these agreements here. We wanted them on Monday. And then we said we'll take them on Thursday. But the timing of this is also critical to us.

ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Do I understand where you are, bottom line, is if they provided a sample of the Disney agreements, as they've said

1	they're going to do on Warner and Sony, and it was
2	I guess we may I don't know if we have specifics
3	about how big the sample is and a declaration that
4	it's representative, if they got that to you timely,
5	and we have to figure out what that means, you'd be
6	satisfied. Not gleeful
7	MR. GARRETT: I won't be satisfied, no.
8	I think I should have had them last Friday.
9	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: You can live with
10	it. Well, satisfied is a bad word, but you could live
11	with that.
12	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: It's something you'd

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: It's something you'd be willing to live with, with gritting your teeth in order to help things move forward.

MR. GARRETT: You put that so gently.

ARBITRATOR GULIN: Have you come to any -- have you had any discussions about the number of actual agreements and what manner they'll be sampled?

MR. GARRETT: Well, yes. This was not rocket science from our standpoint, and what I did is I said, "Well, we'll take movies one, four, seven, ten, all the way through," and that would give us ten

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

of the 30 movies. And of the television programs, there were seven, so we did one, three, five, and I mean that's my idea of --

ARBITRATOR GULIN: By date?

MR. GARRETT: No, no.

MR. STEINTHAL: Dr. Jaffe just listed them as figures by number, and they just chose numbers. They knew the data corresponding with each of those films, because the way that Jaffe presented it. to be candid, we have no problem, again, that the sample -- instead of arquing or negotiating over whether that's a fair sample or not, I'm happy to get the data from that sample. My biggest problem is Disney because it turned out to be five movies from Disney, three from Paramount and two from Warner Brothers in the movie set. And it just turns out that Disney's my hardest problem, because they've got this log.

CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Can I just ask, I mean as a practical matter, does Disney -- I know from independent experience, is a different kind of fish in certain respects -- I mean as a practical matter,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

1	we've got 400 songs and 30 movies, I mean and the
2	percentages come out the same. If Disney were
3	stricken and you've got 200 songs and it's still the
4	same percentages and everything, I mean the weight is
5	a little different, should we spend a huge amount of
6	time trying to solve the Disney puzzle?
7	MR. STEINTHAL: Well, I guess
8	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Or is there any
9	MR. STEINTHAL: my response to that is,
10	isn't it adequate to have a log kept in the ordinary
11	course with a declaration from the Disney person of
12	and I have an example of the log which, unfortunately,
13	I don't have a lot of copies of, but I'm happy to
14	share it with everybody so you can see the layout of
15	the Disney log, that it's a quite comprehensive
16	document. But we would like
17	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Pass that up. Mr.
18	Garrett has seen this, I'm assuming.
19	MR. STEINTHAL: I just showed it to him
20	briefly beforehand.
21	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Watch these wires when
22	you come forward, Mr. Rich. You're going to need to

do the high jump or something.

MR. STEINTHAL: You're seeing different pages of the same -- of a multi-page document for one movie that Disney produces. This is their log. I think the name of the movie is "Crazy Beautiful." And this the form of the log, and this one has, for all the songs ultimately included, as you'll see, the nature of the use, the publishers, the sync fee. And what you would peer in the declaration is that the quote is the fee in the end. I mean that's basically -- the numbers here are only for those songs that are actually included in the final version of the picture.

And if there's a situation where there's an n/a under it, that would mean not applicable because there was a sync but no master or there was a master but no sync. And there are some annotations where appropriate.

So the question is on Disney, whether with a declaration from the head of Music as to exactly what the log sets forth, and if there are any particular questions that the RIAA has about what is intended by X or Y or Z, then we could have that

included in the declaration, whether we could use the declaration plus the course of business log in lieu of them having to go in and pull the dozens of transactions per film for the five films and two TV shows that turn out to be Disney.

And I'm making that argument because I've been instructed to make that plea on Disney's behalf, knowing that -- and to be fair, we've been -- I mean I got the e-mail over the weekend, I've been in touch with Mr. Garrett as of Monday. We didn't wait. We had a schedule where we were going to deal with discovery disputes on Tuesday. I raised the response to this on Monday to try to get this data as quickly as possible. We are ready to produce the summaries we've received from each of the studios immediately. As long as we have an understanding of what the totality of the discovery obligation will be for each of the studios, and then we can arrange for the sample to be produced within a matter of days.

MR. GARRETT: I might ask under those circumstances why the summaries weren't produced last Friday.

1	MR. STEINTHAL: I didn't have the
2	authority to do it, Bob, that's why.
3	MR. GARRETT: Well, this study here was
4	not done overnight here.
5	MR. STEINTHAL: It was done
6	MR. GARRETT: This is a fairly foreseeable
7	issue that we would want that kind of underlying data.
8	ARBITRATOR GULIN: What do you think's a
9	fair timeline for receiving the samples?
10	MR. GARRETT: Three o'clock today would be
11	fine.
12	(Laughter.)
13	I mean I want this all done this week.
14	This was the week to prepare for the testimony. Once
15	you go into the hearing, as I'm certain the Panel
16	understands from experience, we are basically working
17	around the clock. I'm not going to have a real chance
18	to understand these documents and then contact people
19	about them to try to understand the nuances of how
20	people arrive at these numbers here. This was the
21	week that we have to

ARBITRATOR GULIN: So you want it by

1	Friday?
2	MR. GARRETT: I told him Thursday.
3	ARBITRATOR GULIN: Thursday?
4	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Let me just ask him
5	one more. Would you rather have them turn over to you
6	several boxes of documents here in Washington, the
7	sample and the stuff, versus your sending somebody
8	down tomorrow to the studio to be shown the same
9	things that
10	MR. GARRETT: Definitely. I mean I
11	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: You want them
12	brought to you. Okay.
13	MR. GARRETT: Yes. I definitely want to
14	look at it. We made that clear. We are not sending
15	somebody out to California.
16	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: Okay.
17	MR. STEINTHAL: I made that offer
18	previously.
19	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: What we'd like to do,
20	Mr. Garrett, is to ask you to draft an order, which
21	we've asked you to state now for the record, so that
22	we can make sure that it's agreed; that we direct the

1	parties the casters to provide these background
2	documents that we will issue. You all will make your
3	best efforts with these non-clients non-parties
4	to get what you can.
5	And we have a great deal of confidence,
6	Mr. Steinthal, in your persuasive and brokering
7	ability to produce what we'll need.
8	MR. GARRETT: Well, the order I would
9	draft, Your Honor, is that pages 17 through 22 of Dr.
10	Jaffe's testimony
11	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Well, the alternative.
12	No, it's the other order that we
13	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: I think what we're
14	talking about is the summaries and logs and so on that
15	he indicated, and samples with respect to all three
16	companies.
17	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Yes.
18	ARBITRATOR VON KANN: And if those are not
19	obtainable, we'll have to consider whether that
20	portion of Jaffe gets stricken or not.
21	MR. GARRETT: Okay, we'll do that.
22	Also, on Jaffe, we had two requests that

1	I just want to clarify what the status of those are.
2	One, in footnote 60 of his report, Dr.
3	Jaffe says that he had reviewed evidence that
4	supported some conclusion that is stated there. And
5	we've asked for that evidence, whatever it was that
6	Dr. Jaffe was referring to. And we have not received
7	anything. And I don't know exactly what the status of
8	that request is.
9	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Mark, are you on the
10	line?
11	MR. JACOBY: Yes. And the answer is
12	CHAIRMAN VAN LOON: Can I interrupt for
13	just a second?
14	Do we need this to be in closed session?
15	MR. GARRETT: No, this part can be in open
16	session.
17	(Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the proceedings
18	went into Open Session.)
19	
20	
21	
22	

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in

the matter of:

Hearing: Digital Performance Right

in Sound Recording and Ephemeral

Recording,

Docket No. 2000-9 CARP DTRA 1 & 2

Before:

Library of Congress

Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel

Date:

October 10, 2001

Place:

Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.